

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 7-12 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Bingham et al.(PG Pub.2002/0069094, will be referred to as Bingham hereinafter). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A) It is noted that the Office Action does not explicitly provide any description of the basis for rejecting claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 15-16 and 19-20. Applicant respectfully points out that MPEP 706.07 admonishes that "Before final rejection is in order a clear issue should be developed between the examiner and applicant." and that "The examiner should never lose sight of the fact that in every case the applicant is entitled to a full and fair hearing ..." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 15-16 and 19-20, or supply the basis for the rejections in subsequent non-final office action to enable Applicant to fairly respond to the rejections of claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 15-16 and 19-20.

B) Bingham disclosed a meeting facility resources reservation system and method which receive meeting facility criteria from a meeting planner or an employee of a meeting facility provider. Embedded with a computerized and network environment, Bingham tried to provide an integrated mechanism to resolve the complicated, time-consuming planning regarding group-related meetings or events. Many friendly human interfaces are implemented for reservation issues especially can be clearly noted in FIG.6 through FIG.14. The immediate application area of Bingham is not inside an enterprise. Moreover, the disclosed features of Bingham fail to teach all limitations claimed in the present application as described below.

Claim 1 states that each approved reservation records (in the claimed step "storing a plurality of approved reservation records...") contains an approved name list of participators. In Bingham, only number of attendees can be input in the reservation requesting phase (Fig.7). As a matter of fact, it is by no means necessary in a commercial reservation system like that disclosed

in Bingham to have the name list of all attendees (participators) to be specified. Under an enterprise environment, however, the claimed invention is able to "send an approved reservation notice to the applicant and notify the other relevant participators" (Spec, page 3, lines 19-21) automatically with the claimed feature as well as the claimed "outputting" step, and to prevent the user from "notifying each participator of the reservation one by one" (Spec, page 1, PRIOR ART paragraph). As indicated by MPEP 2131, "TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM" and "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Accordingly, Applicant disagrees that the limitation in the claimed "storing a plurality of approved reservation records..." step and "outputting ..." step have been provided, taught, or contemplated in the recited reference Bingham. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the original claim 1 is not anticipated by Bingham and requests that the Examiner withdraws the rejection of claim 1.

Furthermore, since claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and have recited more limitations, it is believed that they are in condition for allowance. In fact, some of the added limitations in these claims are believed to be novel per se from the recited reference Bingham. Among them includes, for example, the claimed "requesting" step of claim 3 (Bingham is silent on the case when a user is not allowed to login), the claimed "allowing" step of claim 4 (Bingham did not provide a query mode), as well as the claimed "outputting" step of claim 7 (Bingham did not automatically suggest anything when the reservation time span is not available, the user must himself manually resolve the problem by the information provided by the system (item 524 in Fig.5 as well as paragraph 0036 and FIG.11)). Based on above argument, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws the rejections of claims 2-8.

C) Having limitation similar to claim 1, the independent claims 9 and 17 and all the claims dependent therefrom are also believed to be novel from the recited reference Bingham. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws the rejections of claims 9-12 and 15-20.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 5-6 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham in view of Fukuma (U.S. 5,909,668). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

D) Claims 5-6 and claims 13-14 respectively depend from independent claim 1 and 9 which are not anticipated by Bingham as discussed above.

E) It is further noted by the Applicant that the cancellation request according to Fukuma is based on a "cancel command" and the "reservation number" (Fukuma, Col.11, lines 10-14, and step 901 of FIG.9) instead of the matching of the "cancellation time span" and the "approved time span" as claimed in the "receiving" and "processing" steps in original claims 5 and 13. Therefore, Fukuma does not provide the limitation of the claimed cancellation mechanism. "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)" and "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)", MPEP 2143.03. In this sense, Bingham, alone or in combination with Fukuma, does not cover all limitations of claim 5-6 and 13-14.

It is believed that both arguments D and E invalidate the alleged rejections under 35 U.S.C.103. Applicant accordingly respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws the rejections of claims 5-6 and 13-14.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims 1-20 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP


Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: January 31, 2007
BJH/ayw